

APPENDIX A

REVISIONS TO THE EVALUATION DESIGN

Since the completion of the final design report in January 2002, some circumstances have changed, requiring minor revisions to the evaluation design. These revisions include: (1) the addition of Arizona as the sixth demonstration state, (2) the completion of the comparison site selection process for Michigan, and (3) clarifications to the data specifications. This appendix describes these revisions.

A. ADDITION OF ARIZONA

In February 2002, Arizona entered into a cooperative agreement with USDA to implement an application assistance demonstration. Arizona's application assistance program will be implemented in Yavapai and Pinal counties, which are two rural counties located near Maricopa County. The demonstration plans to hire ten application assistants who will provide FSP pre-screening and application assistance on-site at Arizona's Department of Economic Security offices and in places where seniors gather, such as senior centers, housing projects, food banks, and faith-based organizations. The application assistants will be hired through the Senior Community Services Employment Program (SCSEP). As a result, assistants will be similar to the FSP applicants in terms of age and income. The demonstration also intends to distribute information about the FSP and nutrition education materials at grocery stores, pharmacies, and community events. Staff from the Arizona Nutrition Network and the Aging & Adult Administration will oversee the development and distribution of the nutrition education materials. Table A.1 contains a list of stakeholders in Arizona.

The two demonstration counties are somewhat similar in characteristics. In Pinal County over 600 elderly individuals received food stamp participants in September 2001, an increase of 11 percent from the previous year (Table A.2). Approximately 2 percent of the county's elderly population participates in the FSP. The total county population is 16 percent age 65 and older, 30 percent nonwhite and there are 34 people per square mile. In Yavapai County, almost 450

elderly individuals received food stamps in September 2001, an increase of 15 percent from the previous year (Table A.3). Approximately 1.2 percent of the county's elderly population participates in the FSP. The county is 22 percent age 65 and older, 8 percent nonwhite and there are 21 people per square mile.

The comparison group for Pinal County includes Yuma and Gila counties. These two counties served an average of 482 elderly FSP participants in September 2001, an increase of 5.5 percent from the previous year, and approximately 2.4 percent of their total elderly population. The counties are, on average, 18 percent nonwhite, 27 percent age 65 and older and have 20 people per square mile.

The comparison county for Yavapai County is Mohave County. Mohave County had 663 elderly FSP participants in September 2001, an increase of 13 percent from the previous year, and approximately 2.1 percent of the county's elderly population. The county is 21 percent age 65 and older, 10 percent nonwhite and has 12 people per square mile.

B. COMPARISON SITES FOR MICHIGAN

Due to delays in receiving participation data for Michigan, the final comparison group was not established in time to be included in the January 2002 design report. Since then, we have completed the comparison site selection for Michigan (Table A.4).

Michigan's application assistance demonstration will be implemented in Genesee County. In 2001, there were more than 2,500 elderly FSP participants in Genesee County, about 3 percent of the county's total elderly population, and an increase of 8.6 percent from the previous year. The county is 24.7 percent nonwhite, and 11.6 percent of the population is age 65 or older. There are 682 people per square mile in Genesee County.

The comparison group includes five counties: Saginaw, Ingham, Muskegon, Berrien, and Kalamazoo.¹¹ On average, the comparison counties have fewer elderly FSP participants (1,187) than Genesee County, but about the same proportion of all elderly individuals that participate in the FSP (2.7 percent). Elderly participation in the FSP increased by an average of 7.5 percent in the comparison counties. The counties are on average 19.9 percent nonwhite, 12.3 percent age 65 or older, and have about 360 people per square mile.

As with all states, sensitivity analysis should be conducted on the impact estimates for Michigan. This sensitivity analysis should begin by examining the next tier of similar sites – those with low similarity index scores but that are not in the initial comparison group. There also is a second set of sites that should be examined in the sensitivity analysis. Because Michigan's demonstration builds upon the existing MiCAFE on-line application system, a second set of special comparisons sites should be drawn from those counties that have the MiCAFE system in place. The presence or absence of the MiCAFE application may affect elderly participation patterns in the absence of the Elderly Nutrition Demonstration because the application currently prescreens for other nutrition programs and may include some FSP related outreach. It may be the case that the outreach associated with the MiCAFE application is driving the FSP participation trends. To test this hypothesis, the evaluation should compare participation patterns in Genesee County with the average adjusted patterns in other, similar Project FRESH counties.

A second special issue in Michigan is that the city of Saginaw is currently implementing a variety of FSP outreach strategies through a demonstration project. This demonstration does not target directly the elderly. Rather, it targets low-income families with children, former TANF

¹¹Chippewa County, which has a low similarity index score, is not included in the comparison group because the county is extremely rural, located in the Upper Peninsula, and the minorities are predominantly Native American, making it a poor match for Genesee County.

recipients, and able-bodied adults. Nevertheless, elderly participation patterns in Saginaw County, which is included in the comparison group, could be affected by this demonstration. However, the evaluators should examine whether elderly participation patterns in Saginaw County are distinctly different from patterns in the other comparison counties.

C. CLARIFICATIONS FOR DATA SPECIFICATIONS

The data specifications for the caserecord extracts and survey contact database appear in Appendix B of the design report. After discussing the data specifications with representatives from some of the demonstration states, we identified the following issues that warrant clarification:

- ***Caserecord Extracts – number of observation months.*** Assuming the evaluation period ends in September 2003, there can be at most 10, not 11, observation months. For all demonstrations, there will be three observation months covering the period before each demonstration begins serving clients. Demonstrations that begin in February 2002 will have seven additional observation months, for a total of 10 observations months. Demonstrations that begin after March 2002 will have less than 10 total observation months. All states will be asked to provide an extract for September 2003, regardless of the month of their previous extract.¹²
- ***Caserecord Extracts – data for entire state.*** Some state data managers have expressed concern that providing data on all FSP caserecords poses undue burden. The rationale for collecting data on all FSP cases is that the evaluation will need to compare elderly participation patterns with nonelderly patterns in the pilot and comparison counties. However, the amount of information needed about households without elderly is much less than the amount needed about households with elderly. Since the large number of caserecords records requested is a source of burden for some states, we can give states the option to provide fewer caserecords if they provide some additional tabulations. Specifically, the options are:
 - (1) provide electronic caserecords for all FSP households in the state (and let the evaluator construct tabulations of nonelderly households)
 - (2) provide electronic caserecords for all households with elderly in the state, and provide a set of tabulations summarizing participation patterns by county for nonelderly households

¹²This will change if the evaluation period is extended beyond September 2003.

States should choose the option that minimizes their burden given the design of their MIS and staff availability. If states choose option 2, the tabulations provided will need to show the number of participants and households, as well as the amount of benefits received, for all FSP households. The tabulations will need to show participation counts by county and by subgroup (such as nonelderly households, households with disabled, single person households, etc.). States that choose this option will need to work with the evaluator who will specify all of the requirements in the tabulations.

- ***Survey Contact Database – contents (benefit amount) during first full month after application.*** One of the requested elements in the survey contact database is the “FSP benefit amount received in month of application/recertification.” This is somewhat incorrect. What the database should contain is:

FSP benefit amount in the month of recertification; if the case has not been recertified since application, then the FSP benefit amount in the first *full month* of benefits after application

Because some cases receive pro-rated benefits in the month of application, the original specification could lead to low benefit estimates for many households.

- ***Survey Contact Database – contents (households and units).*** Various elements requested in the survey contact database refer to either the “FSP Unit” or the “FSP Household.” In this context, these terms are used interchangeably. They both refer to all individuals receiving food stamp benefits as part of the same case.

TABLE A.1
ARIZONA STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholder Type	Organization	Key Staff
Grantee	Arizona Department of Economic Security: Family Assistance Administration	Program and project specialist
		Data systems analyst
		Fiscal staff
	Aging & Adult Administration	Staff nutritionist
		Title V (Senior Community Services Employment Program) older worker unit manager
		Application assistants
Nonprofit Partner	Arizona Nutrition Network	Community nutrition services team leader
Food Assistance Organizations	Association of Arizona Food Banks	Executive director
	Arizona Hunger Advisory Council	Chairperson
Other Stakeholders	Northern Arizona Council of Governments Area Agency on Aging	Director
	Pinal-Gila Council for Senior Citizens Area Agency on Aging	Executive director
	Arizona Department of Health Services, Bureau of Community and Family Health Services, Office of Nutrition Services	Chief, Office of Nutrition Services
	Resident Service coordinators —at senior housing complexes	

TABLE A.2
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA

County	Similarity Index Components						
	Similarity Index	Elderly FSP Participants			Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
		Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation			
Pilot County							
Pinal County	0.0	638	2.0	11.1	29.6	16.2	33.5
Comparison Group							
Yuma County	5.5	756	2.9	5.9	31.7	16.5	29.0
Gila County	9.4	207	2.0	5.1	22.2	19.8	10.8
Mean	7.5	482	2.4	5.5	26.9	18.2	19.9
Other Counties							
Pima County	10.4	2,926	2.4	8.6	24.9	14.2	91.8
Cochise County	10.9	802	4.6	7.8	23.3	14.7	19.1
Mohave County	12.2	663	2.1	13.3	9.9	20.5	11.6
Graham County	13.1	173	4.3	5.5	32.9	11.9	7.2
La Paz County	15.6	95	1.9	23.4	25.8	25.8	4.4
Yavapai County	16.0	449	1.2	14.8	8.1	22.0	20.6
Coconino County	20.0	282	3.5	-2.8	36.9	7.0	6.2
Greenlee County	21.0	28	3.3	-12.5	25.8	9.9	4.6
Maricopa County	22.2	6,091	1.7	10.4	22.6	11.7	333.8
Navajo County	24.0	596	6.1	8.2	54.1	10.0	9.8
Santa Cruz County	24.8	397	9.6	5.3	24.0	10.7	31.0
Apache County	53.3	808	14.1	4.4	80.5	8.3	6.2
Mean		972	3	7	26.6	15.3	42
Median		482	2	8	25.8	14.7	19
Min		28	1	-13	8.1	7.0	4
Max		6,091	10	23	54.1	25.8	334

TABLE A.3
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA

County	Similarity Index	Similarity Index Components					
		Elderly FSP Participants			Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
		Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation			
Pilot County							
Yavapai County	0.0	449	1.2	14.8	8.1	22.0	20.6
Comparison Group							
Mohave County	4.8	663	2.1	13.3	9.9	20.5	11.6
Other Counties							
Gila County	13.5	207	2.0	5.1	22.2	19.8	10.8
La Paz County	15.5	95	1.9	23.4	25.8	25.8	4.4
Pinal County	16.1	638	2.0	11.1	30	16	34
Yuma County	20.9	756	2.9	5.9	31.7	16.5	29.0
Cochise County	21.7	802	4.6	7.8	23.3	14.7	19.1
Pima County	23.0	2,926	2.4	8.6	24.9	14.2	91.8
Graham County	27.9	173	4.3	5.5	32.9	11.9	7.2
Maricopa County	32.0	6,091	1.7	10.4	22.6	11.7	333.8
Greenlee County	33.0	28	3.3	-12.5	25.8	9.9	4.6
Coconino County	34.8	282	3.5	-2.8	36.9	7.0	6.2
Santa Cruz County	35.9	397	9.6	5.3	24.0	10.7	31.0
Navajo County	39.3	596	6.1	8.2	54.1	10.0	9.8
Apache County	68.7	808	14.1	4.4	80.5	8.3	6.2
Mean		1,007	3	7	26.6	15.1	44
Median		523	3	8	25.4	14.5	15
Min		28	1	-13	8.1	7.0	4
Max		6,091	10	23	54.1	25.8	334

TABLE A.4
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR GENESEE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

County	Similarity Index	Similarity Index Components					
		Elderly FSP Participants			Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
		Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation			
Pilot County							
Genesee	0.0	2,506	2.9	8.6	24.7	11.6	681.5
Comparison Group							
1 Saginaw	5.7	1,284	2.6	5.2	24.7	13.5	259.6
2 Ingham	6.1	1,334	2.9	6.3	20.5	9.4	499.7
3 Muskegon	8.4	1,182	3.0	13.2	18.7	12.9	334.4
4 Berrien	9.5	1,067	2.5	5.3	20.3	14.4	284.5
5 Kalamazoo	9.9	1,066	2.4	7.5	15.4	11.4	424.6
Mean	7.9	1,187	2.7	7.5	19.9	12.3	360.6
Other Counties							
Chippewa	7.0	192	2.3	9.1	24.1	12.7	24.7
Washtenaw	10.4	864	2.1	6.7	22.6	8.1	454.8
Calhoun	10.5	916	2.6	10.4	16.1	13.7	194.6
Kent	11.1	2,322	2.3	14.7	16.9	10.4	671.0
Baraga	12.0	69	2.5	13.1	21.4	16.3	9.7
Oakland	12.9	5,043	2.2	3.8	17.2	11.3	1367.9
Montcalm	14.8	356	2.8	9.2	5.2	12.1	86.5
Jackson	15.2	745	2.1	7.5	11.5	12.9	224.1
Van Buren	15.3	666	3.8	9.0	12.1	12.3	124.8
Oceana	15.4	192	3.2	10.3	9.6	14	49.7
Cass	15.8	329	2.5	14.2	10.8	13.6	103.9
Newaygo	16.9	327	3.2	9.7	5.2	12.8	56.9
Isabella	17.2	240	2.7	2.6	8.5	9	110.4
St Clair	17.3	770	2.2	9.2	5.0	12.2	226.5
Bay	17.7	709	2.5	8.7	5.1	14.7	248.1
Eaton	17.7	306	1.7	9.7	9.7	11.3	179.6
Houghton	17.8	312	2.8	9.5	4.5	15.5	35.6
Branch	18.3	255	2.4	13.3	6.6	13.1	90.3
St Joseph	19.0	338	2.3	3.0	6.5	13	123.9
Midland	19.1	300	2.0	8.3	4.5	12	159.1
Emmet	19.3	166	2.5	4.4	5.7	14.3	67.2
Osceola	19.4	174	3.1	10.1	2.5	14.2	41.0
Allegan	19.5	397	2.0	13.1	6.5	11.1	127.6
Tuscola	19.9	266	2.1	9.5	4.0	12.8	71.7
Crawford	20.2	113	3.1	8.7	3.6	16.6	25.6
Charlevoix	20.7	160	2.7	15.1	3.7	14.9	62.6
Sanilac	20.8	328	2.8	14.3	3.1	15.4	46.2
Shiawassee	20.9	346	2.3	1.8	2.6	12	133.0
Monroe	21.0	427	1.5	8.7	4.6	11.1	264.9
Lenawee	21.2	356	1.7	3.8	7.5	12.7	131.7
Mason	21.6	215	2.6	13.2	4.2	16.8	57.1
Hillsdale	21.6	236	2.1	5.8	2.4	13.3	77.7
Delta	21.9	282	2.6	12.8	4.2	17	32.9
Barry	22.1	204	1.7	6.8	2.6	11.8	102.1

TABLE A.4 (Continued)
SIMILARITY INDEX FOR GENESEE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

County	Similarity Index	Similarity Index Components					
		Elderly FSP Participants			Nonwhite Population (Percent)	Age 65+ Population (Percent)	Population Density
		Total	Participation Rate	Percent Change in Participation			
Menominee	22.3	197	2.5	11.3	3.8	17.3	24.3
Lapeer	22.3	239	1.8	6.7	3.8	9.6	134.4
Alpena	22.4	228	2.6	10.7	1.8	17.1	54.6
Macomb	22.5	3,192	1.8	16.5	7.3	13.7	1642.0
Mecosta	22.8	321	3.9	18.0	7.3	13.2	72.9
Keweenaw	22.8	23	2.6	9.5	5.0	20.3	4.3
Kalkaska	23.3	132	3.6	13.8	2.5	13.7	29.5
Gladwin	23.5	218	2.8	15.3	2.4	18.3	51.3
Otsego	23.6	132	2.7	23.4	2.5	13.7	45.2
Ionia	23.8	268	2.4	30.1	8.0	10	107.4
Schoolcraft	23.9	112	3.8	15.5	11.3	18.6	7.6
Marquette	23.9	288	1.9	17.6	4.9	13.5	35.5
Mackinac	24.0	36	1.0	0.0	19.9	18.2	11.7
Gratiot	24.1	230	2.3	28.5	8.0	13.5	74.2
Oscoda	24.2	87	2.7	10.1	2.2	20.2	16.7
Alger	24.4	72	2.4	28.6	12.2	17.2	10.7
Clinton	24.4	133	1.2	7.3	3.6	10.9	113.2
Cheboygan	24.5	159	2.2	3.2	5.2	17.9	36.9
Wexford	25.0	261	3.7	17.0	2.7	14.0	53.9
Ontonagon	25.3	83	2.6	7.8	2.8	21.6	6.0
Ottawa	25.8	350	1.0	17.8	8.5	10.1	421.0
Arenac	25.9	187	3.9	14.7	4.6	16.6	47.1
Manistee	26.3	237	3.2	24.1	5.8	18.1	45.1
Clare	26.7	310	3.6	17.0	2.6	17.3	55.1
Gogebic	26.8	193	2.5	2.1	5.8	22.6	15.8
Antrim	26.9	114	1.8	4.6	3.0	17.5	48.4
Ogemaw	27.3	262	3.9	10.1	2.5	18.8	38.4
Huron	27.9	232	1.9	5.9	2.0	19.4	43.1
Presque Isle	28.5	117	2.2	7.3	1.9	22.3	21.8
Dickinson	28.9	143	1.6	11.7	2.0	18.1	35.9
Livingston	28.9	206	1.1	13.8	2.9	8.3	276.3
Grand Traverse	29.7	244	1.7	28.4	3.5	13.1	167.0
Iron	30.1	137	2.2	7.0	3.7	25.2	11.3
Roscommon	30.5	221	2.3	13.3	2.0	23.8	48.9
Missaukee	30.6	182	5.2	8.3	2.5	14.8	25.5
Montmorency	31.5	118	2.9	22.9	1.6	23.9	18.8
Benzie	32.6	59	1.4	22.9	3.6	17.5	49.8
Alcona	33.2	87	1.8	4.8	2.0	24.5	17.4
Luce	33.5	91	4.8	42.2	17.2	15.4	7.8
Iosco	33.7	232	2.6	32.6	3.1	21.6	49.8
Lake	35.3	207	5.7	24.0	15.3	19.7	20.0
Wayne	35.8	19,332	3.8	2.3	48.3	12.1	3356.9
Leelanau	40.6	39	0.8	39.3	6.5	17.4	60.5